DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 256 CS 502 945

AUTHOR Portnoy, Enid P.; Gardner, Julie M.
TITLE A Perceptual Measure of Children's Developmental Somatotypic Preferences.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (71st, Ocean City, MD, April 24-26, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Children; Elementary Education; *Interpersonal Attraction; Nonverbal Communication; *Perceptual Development; *Personality Traits; *Physical Characteristics; Research; *Role Perception
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

Somatotyping is a term that has evolved for the reliable recognition of the expected relationship between body type and personality traits. Using a somatotypic measure, a study was conducted to identify the developmental changes in children's attraction preferences within their own peer groups, as tested in kindergarten, third, and sixth grades. The major attraction dimensions measured were physical, social, and task attraction. A total of 347 students participated. The students were shown posters with silhouettes illustrating three extreme body types (ectomorphy, mesomorphy, and endomorphy) and were asked to select a preferred body type related to the series of attraction variables being measured. The results indicated that a clear stereotype of body type attraction perceptions and preferences does exist for children of these ages. Generally, kindergarten children preferred the ectomorph, while third and sixth grade students preferred the mesomorph for all variables measured. A steadily increasing preference toward the mesomorph and away from the endomorph was observed as grade level advanced. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188256

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PERCEPTUAL MEASURE OF CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENTAL SOMATOTYPIC PREFERENCES

Enid P. Portnoy and Julie M. Gardner

Speech Communication Department

West Virginia University

Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Enid P. Portnoy
Julie M. Gardner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper competitively selected for presentation ECA Convention -

Nonverbal Communication Interest Group.

April 24-26, 1980, Ocean City, Maryland

CS205265

A PERCEPTUAL MEASURE OF CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENTAL SOMATOTYPIC PREFERENCES

Enid P. Portnoy and Julie M. Gardner

Abstract

This study attempted to identify the perceptions of children in kindergarten, third, and sixth grades as measured by same-sex somatotype silhouettes. Children's perceptions of physical, social, and task attraction, intelligence, and athletic ability in regard to the silhouettes were examined.

Hypothesized results indicated that a clear stereotype does exist for children of these ages. Generally, kindergarteners preferred the ectomorph, while third and sixth graders preferred the mesomorph for all variables measured. A steadily increasing preference toward the mesomorph and away from the endomorph was observed as grade level advanced. Future research implications associated with children's somatotypic perceptions are described.

A Perceptual Measure of Children's Developmental Somatotypic Preferences

In American society today, physical appearance has become a significant variable which appears to predict the quantity, quality, and type of interpersonal relationships we have with others. Media images of the "ideal" person are continually being projected, with primary emphasis placed upon the physical appearance of an individual.

Physical attractiveness studies have been reported in the literature which relate to clothing (c.f. Clements, 1976; Gibson, 1969; Hamid, 1968, 1969) adornments such as glasses, makeup, beards, etc. (c.f. Kenny and Fletcher, 1973) height (c.f. Baker and Redding, 1962; Belda, 1972; Wilson, 1968) and body type studies (c.f. Cortes and Gatti, 1965; Lerner, 1969; Sheldon, 1954; Wells and Siegel, 1961).

Somatotyping is the term which has evolved for the "reliable recognition of the expected relationship between the body type and personality traits." (Spiegel and Machotka, 1974). As we are judged by our body build, so we, in turn, receive messages from others which constantly evoke personality responses associated with these body types. Although research cautions us to avoid believing that one's temperament is a direct result of body type, the research overwhelmingly points to the conclusion that a firm correlation exits between the two variables (c.f. Lerner and Gellert, 1969; Walker, 1963; Wells and Siegel, 1961; Strongman and Hart, 1968; Dibiase and Hjelle, 1968; Sleet, 1969).

Psychologists who have devoted a considerable amount of time to the study of bodytyping and its association with personality configurations have treated body appearance as a coded communication system. Most research has been concerned with the significance of such messages for adult and/or late adolescent subjects (c.f. Berscheid and Walster, 1970, 1974; Lerner. 1973, 1976; Sigall and Landy, 1973; Signall and Ostrove, 1975).

Children are not immune to the pressure of instant personality evaluations. A few studies (c.f. Cortes and Gatti, 1970; Dion and Berscheid, 1974; Staffieri, 1967; Walker, 1962, 1963) have utilized young children as research subjects, but with the exceptions of Staffieri (1967) few have attempted a chronological development of somatotypic perceptions of young children. Staffieri (1967) suggested that stereotypic perceptions of children's bodytypes are formulated in children as early as age six, and that accuracy of self-perceptions may not develop until eight or nine years of age.

The question remains: is attractiveness a significant variable for young children? Do such perceptions remain constant as children advance in age? In what ways, developmentally, do attractiveness perceptions of children, vary based on somatotyping?

This study will be concerned with the identification of developmental changes in children's attraction preferences within their own peer groups, as tested in kindergarten, third and sixth grades. The three major attraction dimensions measured will include physical attraction, social attraction, and task attraction, as identified by Byrne (1971).

Added to these dimensions for this study are two variables - the expressed perceptions of athletic prowess, and perceptions of intellectual ability, as represented by children's body types. At present, our society supports the image of the more muscular, athletic individual as "hero, heroine." Evidence of such perceptions seems strongly supported throughout pre-adolescent and adolescent years, but preferences for such individuals have not been specifically evaluated chronologically in a child's early years. In addition, pressure on students to "do well" in terms of intellectual ability, continues to be present in academic environments. Perceived intellectual ability has not been researched as a significant variable in determining children's peer preferences in terms of social, physical and task attractiveness partners. The extent to which a person can make judgments regarding others by knowing a few of their attitudes and abilities has been described in the research (Byrne, 1971). And, according to Longstreth (1968) popularity and friendship are often associated with one another in attractiveness studies. "A popular child is one who other children want to be with and who is thus a strong source of influence." (p. 500). Traits of intellectual ability, attractiveness, and activeness have been associated with popularity (Longstreth, 1968; Tuddenham, 1951). In addition, Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Cavior and Dokecki, 1973 suggest that likeability is highly correlated with attractiveness.

Somatotyping (children's perceptions of children)

A study conducted by Cavior (1970) found a significant relationship between physical attractiveness and somatotype among children. Mesomorphs were perceived as more physically attractive than either ectomorphs or endomorphs among fifth and eleventh grade boys and girls. Using even younger subjects, Staffieri (1967) found a preference for the mesomorph does not appear until age seven and is not firmly establised until age eight. Cavior and Lombardi (1973) concluded that children begin to acquire this cultural criteria of attractiveness at age six, and by age eight are judging attractiveness as adults do. In these and other studies the endomorph is usually assigned negative traits and is consistently chosen as the least preferred body type. The ectomorph is also rated unfavorably but has a weak, submissive association in constrast to the endomorph's ascribed brashness and aggressiveness. Other researchers (Hanley, 1951; Staffieri, 1965, 1967, 1972; Cortes and Gatti, 1966; Kagan, 1966; Lerner and Gellert, 1969; Johnson and Staffieri, 1971; Lerner, 1971; Korn and Lerner, 1972; Susan, 1973) have also concluded children exhibit stereotypic perceptions of each other based on somatotype. In a study by Berscheid and Dion (1974) children as young as kindergarten age, discriminated attractive from unattractive persons based on physical appearance.

Summation of Research

The literature dealing with children as subjects substantiates the notion that peer perceptions of attraction variables and personality traits are often based on nonverbal body type appearance cues. Our society's dependence on media models and body type stereotypes is heavily oriented toward the muscular physique for both males and females. Based on the review of literature and current cultural body preferences, the following hypotheses are proposed:

I.

A. It is hypothesized that more children will prefer the mesomorph body type on the basis of physical, social and task attraction as well as perceived athletic ability. Research further suggests (c.f. Thornton, 1944) that individuals with glasses are judged more intelligent than those without glasses. In terms of this perceived intellectual ability trait, many Americans tend to equate intellectual competencies with the "thin and lean scholar." On the basis of this information-

B. It is further hypothesized that more children will prefer the ectomorph body type on the basis of perceived intellectual ability. Additionally, it is suggested that age discrepancy between subjects tested will be revealed by the lack of significantly consistent perceptions of body type among the two younger grade groups.

II.

A. It is hypothesized that children's somatotypic preferences for their peers, in terms of physical, social and task attraction will reveal a developmental shift between kindergarten, third, and sixth grades, in that:
   A. Kindergarten children will prefer the mesomorph for task and social attraction, and the ectomorph or mesomorph for physical attraction.
   B. Third graders will prefer the mesomorph for social and physical attraction but will not display a consistent preference for any body type for task attractiveness.
   The idea of task attractiveness has not been firmly established at this stage of a child's development, although each child may select the silhouette which appears to be more homophilous to their own perceptions of a desirable and previous work partner.
   C. Sixth graders will prefer the mesomorph for social and physical attraction and the ectmorph for task attraction. Early school experiences may encourage the development of children's perceptions regarding intellectual ability and athletic ability in their peers. As grade level advances, academic success and athletic achievements appear to be singled out for overt approval by authority figures. On this basis we make these additional predictions:

III. It is hypothesized that children's perceptions of athletic and intellectual ability, as reflected in somatotypic drawings of body type, will show a developmental shift between kindergarten, third and sixth grades, i.e. that:
   A. Kindergarten children will not display any significant consistency in terms of perceived intelligence or athletic ability choices.
   B. Third grade children will perceive the mesomorph as having the most athletic ability and the ectomorph as being the most intelligent.

C. Sixth grade children will perceive the mesomorph as having the most athletic ability and the ectmomorph as being the most intelligent.

IV. Finally, it is hypothesized that there will be an over-all difference in the perceptions of male and female at all grade levels in perceptions of pyhsical, social and task attraction preferences; females will prefer the ectomorph body type while males will prefer the mesomorph body type. Again, the media becomes a powerful influence in determining our perceptions of sexual distinctions. Television, in particular, is commonly used as an educational reference point for children. Although we may think we know the extent of the educational messages it communicates, the sublety of nonverbal cues such as somato-typing and its associations can not be overlooked.

METHODS

Subjects:

Three hundred and forty seven students, male and female in three grade levels (kindergarten, third, and sixth grades) within six public schools were selected as research subjects for this study. The schools were randomly selected by the Board of Education as representing a cross section of socio-economic groups of children. Within the total subject population were forty nine kindergarten subjects, one hundred eighty-six third graders, and one hundred twelve sixth graders. Students were informed that they were involved in a project designed to collect information on children's reactions to different body drawings of children their own age.

Each subject completed an instrument (Figure 1) measuring somatotypic preferences of same sex peer attraction variables. All subject responses were anonymous. Upon completion of the test packet children were made aware of the general research nature of the study and its possible implications.

Independent Variables:

The independent variables in this study were subjects' grade level and the sex of the subjects. Most of the research studies using children as subjects suggest that between kindergarten and third grade (ages 6-8) children's attraction preferences solidify. It is further suggested that by sixth grade (ages 11-12) these perceptions will have become consistently stronger. The intent of this paper is to discover the developmental extent of the changes that occur between kindergarten and sixth grade in terms of children's expressed somatotypic attraction perceptions.

Dependent Variables:

Dependent variable measures included three major attraction variables-physical attraction (PAT), social attraction (SAT), and task attraction (TAT), as well as perceived intelligence (INT), and perceived athletic ability (ATH). Reliability of the questions was pretested using forty-nine college students in a basic speech communication course. Students had not been previously informed about any kind of attraction variable. Their task was to mark a proper response to ten questions, as verbally read to them by an experimenter.

In order to determine a method of measuring the attraction variables, body type silhouettes were selected, illustrating the three extremes of body types (ectomorphy, mesomorphy, and endomorphy) originally described by Sheldon (1954). Two eighteen by twelve inch pen and ink posters of both female and male children's body silhouettes were mounted. The visuals were prepared by a graduate Art student, who followed closely the photographic information and proportions of children's anatomy as described in Petersen's Atlas for Somatotyping Children (1967). Validity for the drawings had been tested previously by submitting preliminary silhouettes to forty-nine college undergraduates and five faculty members for body type identification.

Experimenters' Procedures:

Approximate duration of time for data collection in school classrooms was twenty-five minutes. Kindergarten students were randomly placed in groups of five, which made the time allottment as long as forty-five minutes in some schools. All subjects were willing volunteers. The testing procedure was conducted in the regular classroom at each school. The testing environment was similar for all groups.

Utilizing the silhouette posters as visuals in the front of the room, a testing instrument color-keyed to the sex of the subject was administered. Stapled packets of five pages of body type symbols were given to each subject. When all materials were circulated and pencils distributed, oral questioning began.

For kindergarten subjects, questions were posed to groups of five subjects at a time, in order to carefully observe subjects' comfort and ease with the testing instrument. Experimenters were instructed to ask each question twice. Verbal prompting or reinforcement, such as "Now, think" or "Which one would you choose?" was added if the child expressed a need for a third trial. (Figure 1 and 2)

In summary, all subjects were instructed verbally to select a preferred body type related to the series of attraction variables being measured (see Figure 2). Two questions were generated for each variable measured. To confirm the validity of the question posed for each dimension, each pair was analyzed after data was collected, to check if answers correlated significantly on each dependent dimension. Physical, social and task attraction variables proved to be consistently measured by subjects' answers to questions for those variables. Within question pairs measuring perceived intelligence and perceived athletic ability, consistency was not satisfactory. Therefore, results of the questions measuring these variables are questionable. Caution is advised when interpreting these results.

Question Results:

Intelligence

In comparing perceived intelligence answers (INT 1 and 2) the questions do not appear to be highly related to one another. The two questions measuring intelligence were analyzed (X^2 = 5.83, d.f., p = 2123).

Athletic Ability

For perceived athletic ability (ATH 3 and 4), no consistent relation between the cognitive replies to these questions occurred in the data. The two questions measuring athletic ability were analyzed (X^2 = 2.00, d.f. = 4, p = .7355).

Physical Attraction

For physical attraction (PAT 5 and 6), answers to the question pair indicated that they were measuring the same variable (X^2 = 115.65, d.f. = 4, p = .0001).

Social Attraction

Validity for the two questions related to social attraction (SAT 7 and 8) was confirmed (X^2 = 29.97, d.f. = 4, p = .0001).

Task Attraction

Task attraction (TAT 9 and 10) as measured by the question pair also indicated consistency on that dimension (X^2 = 13.04, d.f. = 4, p = .0111).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

The hypotheses will be tested using a series of Chi-square tests. All variables were of nominal level suggesting the use of the Chi-square measurement tests. One-way and two-way chi-square tests will be used to test relationships between the sets of variables. Alpha level was set apriori at .05 for all statistical tests.

DISCUSSION

Children have keen powers of observation. Their habits in associating attraction preferences with specific body types appear to be strongly indicated in this study. Our results clearly indicate that of the three body types, the mesomorph is most often preferred for almost every attraction perception.

The most obvious type of attraction, physical attraction, provides the strongest finding. The mesomorph was the primary choice, for the two older age groups in particular, while the ecomorph was preferred by the kindergarten children. Females of all ages tended to select the ectomorph as more physically attractive than did males. This supports the "slim woman" ideal which currently exists in our society. A decided preference for the ectomorphic female is observed in the choice of print and visual media models and in the expressed preference of adult males toward female bodytypes in and on such media.

Males chose the mesomorph and the endorph as more physically attractive than did females. The masculine ideal counterpart of the "slim woman" is the "well-built, muscular male". In terms of age/class differences, a strong preference for the ectomorph was observed for kindergarten children, while mesomorph was the first choice for the third and sixth graders. Preference for the mesomorph steadily increased by grade level, whereas preference for the endomorph exhibited a steady decrease. This can be explained by noting that as children grow older, the fat-is-ugly stereotype becomes more prominent and deeply ingrained in the mind.

Athletic or muscular prowess as a trait is in popular demand in the American value system. The endomorph, often the least physically active and somewhat clumsy in attempting muscular tasks, is often believed to suffer the greatest associated physical stigma.

The mesomorph was also chosen most often for social attractiveness by children of all ages. No sex differences were revealed, thus indicating that females and males do not differ in terms of body type preferences for social attraction. As with physical attraction, kindergarten children preferred the ectomorph for social attraction and third and sixth graders found the mesomorph the most socially attractive. Once again, the increasing aversion to the endomorphic body type was revealed.

For task attraction, the mesomorph remained the favored choice for all children. A slight sex difference was observed for one of the questions asked. Due to the small sex differences noted, and the lack of such results in the other question measuring task attraction, it can be concluded that sex differences for this attraction dimension are slight and insignificant. Conclusions regarding any age/class differences remain tenuous. One question in the pair revealed a preference by kindergarten children ectomorphs, and third and sixth grade children for mesomorphs. The other question displayed a preference for the mesmorph by all grade levels. It seems obvious that preference for the mesomorph increases by grade levels in terms of task attractiveness.

In examining perceived intelligence, the mesomorph was selected most often by the children in general, while no difference in male-female perceptions was observed. An age/class difference was observed for one of the questions measuring intelligence perceptions. Kindergarten children found the ectomorph to be most intelligent while third and sixth graders chose the mesomorph more often.

In terms of athletic ability, perceptions of the children, in general, leaned toward mesomorphy. A sex effect was revealed for one of the questions: females tended to perceive the ectomorph as having the most athletic ability, and males selected the endomorph and mesomorph more often. On one question, the kindergarten children chose the ectomorph slightly more often than for the other question of the pair. Third and sixth graders appeared more consistent, placing the mesomorph as their top choice for both questions on atheletic ability.

It appears from the results specified above, that a clear stereotype does exist for children in terms of body type attraction perceptions and preferences.

IMPLICATIONS

Children of kindergarten age generally tended to choose the ectomorph for all variables measured in this study. Perhaps a lean, thin body type is seen as more similar to, and thus, more attractive two children at this age. It may be too early in life for children to sense the media's reliance upon the mesomorphic ideal, especially for the physically attractive male role-model. The attributes (physical) of the mesomorph may not yet be called into importance at this stage of development. To be homophilous with their peers (generally ectomorphic) may be the strongest attitude which predicts their choice of the ectomorph.

A steadily increasing preference for the mesomorph was obvious across all grade levels with third and sixth grade subjects. This trend was accompanied by what appears a clear aversion to the endomorphic body type. We note as early as kindergarten age children, a decided discrimination against the endomorphic body type. It seems obvious that, as children grow older, they become more aware of the negative attitudes associated with pudgy, over-weight people in our culture. Females typically exhibited a preference for the ectomorph while males preferred the mesomorphic body type. This result reinforces the notion that differential ideal body type preference for the sexes do exist, even in children at early ages.

Developmentally, as children mature, their body type preferences appear much stronger and more consistent. We can relate these results to our society's insistence upon steraotyping. A child learns to prefer a particular body type which is set before him as an example of "the best" or "the ideal".

Recent research has indicated that sensitivity to nonverbal cues has become more prominent within the last ten years. It is suggested that children might be introduced to the concepts of somatotyping and stereotypes

early in their education. A distinction might well be developed between the major dimensions of social, physical, and task attraction which a child could easily conceptualize.

Expanding this study to include self-concept perceptions might be the next development of the research. Knowledge in this area could be value in the identification and treatment of varying aspects of children's self-esteem and mental health. How comfortable are children with their own body type? Is there a sex difference in children's selection of body type preferences, as compared with their own body type? Is there an expressed preference for one body type to become associated with another specific type? At what age do children become aware of somatotypic perceptions as related to their own physique?

It appears that social expectations related to body type can influence a child's perceptions of his/her peers. The mesomorph has little trouble excelling in most activities, therefore, the encouragement received promotes the continuance of energetic, active participation with others. The ectomorph, finding little success in athletic ability (except perhaps track and field events) devotes a large measure of time and effort to more passive skills i.e. planning, studying, reading (perceived intellectual attractiveness). The endomorph, unable to perform athletically, may over-compensate by becoming socially aggressive and, therefore, further alienate herself/himself and retire, creating an even more isolated, negative image. It is intriguing to question whether the physiques we have, give us clues as to a preferred way of adjusting to life. Do we, as children, begin adopting certain behaviors which make others' perceptions a self-fulfilling prophecy?

Figure 1

Verbal Directions

I am going to show you three silhouettes of different figures of children like you.

One of these figures will be your choice to answer the questions I will ask you.

For each question I will give you a paper with three shapes on it. Make a pencil mark inside the symbol for the picture you choose, like this.

(DEMONSTRATE)

Suppose I ask - "Which figure do you think is the nicest?"

Make your choice - then put a mark inside this symbol.

There is no right answer.

I want you to choose the figure you think is best. You probably won't want to pick the same figure to answer each question because each question is different.

Answer each question according to which figure you think is best.

Figure 2

Interview Questions: Intelligence

K: 1. Which one do you think is the smartest?

2. Which girl (or boy) knows everything?

3rd 1. Which figure is the smartest?

2. Which figure knows everything?

6th: 1. Which one is the smartest?

2. Which one always gets everything right in school?

Interview Questions: Athletic Ability

K: 3. Which girl (or boy) is the best sports player?

4. Which one knows how to play all the games?

3rd: 3. Which figure is the best sports player?

4. Which figure knows how to play all the games?

6th: 3. Which figure is the best sports player?

4. Which one knows how to play all the games?

Appendix

Interview Questions: Physical Attraction

K: 5. Which girl (or boy) is the prettiest/handsomest?

6. Which figure would you like to look like?

3rd: 5. Which girl (or boy) is the prettiest/handsomest?

6. Which figure would you like to look like?

6th: 5. Which girl (or boy) is the prettiest/handsomest?

6. Which figure would you like to look like?

Interview Questions: Social Attraction

K: 7. Which girl (or boy) would you pick for your friend?

8. Which girl (or boy) would you like to play with?

3rd: 7. Which figure would you choose for your friend?

8. Which figure would you pick to play with?

6th: 7. Which figure would you choose for your friend?

8. Which figure would you like to play with?

Interview Questions: Task Attraction

K: 9. Which girl (or boy) would you like to do work in school with?

10. Which one would make a good work partner?

3rd: 9 Which one would you like to do work in school with?

10. Which one would make a good work partner?

6th: 9. Which one would you like to do work in school with?

10. Which one would make the best school worker?

TABLE 1

Physical Attraction

		Question 5			Question 6		
	General Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
	(% of total)	18.44	77.52	14.03	16.71	78.39	4.90
	Sex Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
(frequency)		18	152	11	15	153	13
(expected)	M	33.4	140.3	7.3	30.3	141.9	8.9
(row %)		9.94	83.98	6.08	8.29	84.53	7.18
(frequency)		46	117	3	43	119	4
(expected)	F	30.6	128.7	6.7	27.7	130.1	8.1
(row %)		27.71	70.48	1.81	25.9	71.69	2.41
	Class/Age Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
		26	17	6	24	21	4
	K	9.0	38.0	2.0	8.2	38.4	2.4
		53.06	34.69	12.24	48.98	42.86	8.16
		31	149	6	28	147	11
	3	34.3	144.2	7.5	31.1	145.8	9.1
		16.67	80.11	3.23	15.05	79.03	5.91
		7	103	2	6	104	2
	6	20.7	86.8	4.5	18.7	87.8	5.5
		6.25	91.96	1.79	5.36	92.86	1.79

TABLE 2

Social Attraction

		Question 7			Question 8		
	General Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
	(% of total)	27.67	62.54	9.80	28.53	60.81	10.66
	Sex Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
(frequency)		45	116	20	45	116	20
(expected)	M	50.1	113.2	17.7	51.6	110.1	19.3
(row %)		24.86	64.09	11.05	24.86	64.09	11.05
		51	101	14	54	95	17
	F	45.9	103.8	16.3	47.4	100.9	17.7
		30.72	60.84	8.43	32.53	57.23	10.24
	Class/Age Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
		24	16	9	23	18	8
	K	13.6	30.6	4.8	14.0	29.8	5.2
		48.98	32.65	18.37	46.94	36.73	16.33
		50	118	18	58	104	24
	3	51.5	116.3	18.2	53.1	113.1	19.8
		26.88	63.44	9.68	31.18	55.91	12.90
		22	83	7	18	89	5
	6	31.0	70.0	11.0	32.0	68.1	11.9
		19.64	74.11	6.25	16.07	79.46	4.46

TABLE 3

Task Attraction

		Question 9			Question 10		
	General Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
	(% of total)	31.99	55.33	12.68	21.33	53.60	25.07
	Sex Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
(frequency)		56	100	25	31	96	54
(expected)	M	57.9	100.1	23.0	38.6	97.0	45.4
(row %)		30.94	55.25	13.81	17.13	53.04	29.83
		55	92	19	43	90	33
	F	53.1	91.9	21.0	35.4	89.0	41.6
		33.13	55.42	11.45	25.90	54.22	19.88
	Class/Age Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
		25	18	6	19	22	8
	K	15.7	27.1	6.2	10.4	26.3	12.3
		51.02	36.73	12.24	38.78	44.90	16.33
		43	112	31	34	102	50
	3	59.5	102.9	23.6	39.7	99.7	46.6
		23.12	60.22	16.67	18.28	54.84	26.88
		43	62	7	21	62	29
	6	35.8	62.0	14.2	23.9	60.0	28.1
		38.39	55.36	6.25	18.75	55.36	25.89

TABLE 4

Intelligence

		Question 1			Question 2		
	General Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
	(% of total)	25.07	60.23	14.70	28.82	46.40	24.78
	Sex Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
(frequency)		48	103	30	44	90	47
(expected)	M	45.4	109.0	26.6	52.2	84.0	44.9
(row %)		26.52	56.91	16.57	24.31	49.72	25.97
		39	106	21	56	71	39
	F	41.6	100.0	24.4	47.8	77.0	41.1
		23.49	63.86	12.65	33.73	42.77	23.49
	Class/Age Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
		20	15	14	15	16	18
	K	12.3	29.5	7.2	14.1	22.7	12.1
		40.82	30.61	28.57	30.61	32.65	36.73
		35	123	28	51	87	48
	3	46.6	112.0	27.3	53.6	86.3	46.1
		18.82	66.13	15.05	27.42	46.77	25.81
		32	71	9	34	58	20
	6	28.1	67.5	16.5	32.3	52.0	27.8
		28.57	63.39	8.04	30.36	51.79	17.86

TABLE 5

Athletic Ability

		Question 3			Question 4		
	General Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
	(% of total)	25.36	59.37	15.27	28.24	50.43	21.33
	Sex Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
(frequency)		25	122	34	48	92	41
(expected)	M	45.9	107.5	27.6	51.1	91.3	38.6
(row %)		13.81	67.40	18.78	26.52	50.83	22.65
		63	84	19	50	83	33
	F	42.1	98.5	25.4	46.9	83.7	35.4
		37.95	50.60	11.45	30.12	50.00	19.88
	Class/Age Effect	Ec	M	En	Ec	M	En
		18	15	16	21	20	8
	K	12.4	29.1	7.5	13.8	24.7	10.4
		36.73	30.61	32.65	42.86	40.82	16.33
		59	102	25	45	92	49
	3	47.2	110.4	28.4	52.5	93.8	39.7
		31.72	54.84	13.44	24.19	49.46	26.34
		11	89	12	32	63	17
	6	28.4	66.5	17.1	31.6	56.5	23.9
		9.82	79.46	10.71	28.57	56.25	15.18

References

Baker, E. E. and Redding, W. C. The effects of perceived tallness in persuasive speaking; an experiment. Journal of Communication, 1962, Vol. 12, 51-53.

Belda, P. R. Perception of height as a linear function of attitude similarity. Psychonomic Science, 1972, 27, 197-8.

Berscheid, E. & Dion, K. Physical Attractiveness and Peer Perceptions Among Children. Sociometry, March, 1974, 37, (No. 1), 1-12.

Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. Beauty and the beast. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 16, 194-7.

Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. Physical attractiveness. In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, New York: Academic Press, 1974, 158-210.

Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, ed. L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press, 1969, 4, 35-89.

Byrne, D. The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Byrne, D. & Griffitt, W. A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1964, 4, 699-702.

Cavior, N. Physical attractiveness, perceived attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction among 5th and 11th grade boys and girls. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1970.

Cavior, N. & Dokecki, P.D. Physical attractiveness, perceived attitude similarity, and academic achievement as contributors to interpersonal attraction among adolescents. Developmental Psychology, July, 1973, 9, 44-54.

Cavior, N. & Lombardi, D. Developmental aspects of judgment of physical attractiveness in children. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8 (1), 67-71.

Clements, T. & Platt. Effects of punative dress on classroom behavior of institutional emotionally disturbed adolescents. Psychology Reports, August, 1976, 39 (1), 335-38.

Cortes, J. B. & Gatti, F. Physique and self description of temperment, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 432-39.

Cortes, J. B. & Gatti, F. Physique and motivation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 408-14.

Cortes, J. B. & Gatti, F. Physique and propensity. Psychology Today, October, 1970, 4, 42.

Dibiase, W. J. & Hjelle, L. A. Body type and stereotyped image. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 1143-1146.

Dion, K. K. Young children's stereotyping of facial attractiveness. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 183-88.

Gibson, K. Communication aspects of women's clothes and their relationship to fashionability. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 8, 301-312.

Hamid, P. N. Style of dress as a perceptual cue in impression formation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 26, 904-906.

Hamid, P. N. Changes in person perception as a function of dress. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 29, 191-194.

Hanley, C. Physique and reputation of junior high school boys. Child Development, 1951, 22, 247-260.

Johnson, P.A. & Staffieri, J. R. Stereotypic affective properties of personal names and somatitypes in children. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, (No. 1), 176.

Kretschmer, E. Physique and Character, 2nd edition. New York: Cooper Square, 1970.

Lerner, R. M. The development of stereotyped expectancies of body-build behavior relations. Child Development, 1969, 40, 137-41.

Lerner, R. M. Body build stereotypes and seli identification in three age groups of males. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 9305.

Lerner, R. M. & Gellert, E. Body build identification, preference, and aversion in children. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1 (5), 465-62.

Lerner, R. M. & Korns. The Development of Baby Build Stereotypes in Males. Child Development, 1972, 43, 908-20.

Longstreth, L. R. Psychological Development of the Child. New York: Ronald Press, 1968.

Petersen, G. M. D. Atlas for Somatotyping Children. The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum Ltd., 1967.

Sheldon, W. V. The Varieties of Human Physique. New York: Harper, 1940.

Sheldon, W. V. Atlas of Man: A Guide for Somatotyping the Adult Male at All Ages. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

Signall, H. & Landy, D. Radiating beauty: Effects of having a physically attractive partner of person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, November, 1973, 28 (2), 218-24.

Signall, H. & Ostrove, N. Beautiful but dangerous: Effects of offender attractiveness and nature of the crime on juridic judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, March, 1975, 31 (3), 410-14.

Sleet, D. Physique and social image. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 295-99.

Spiegel, J. & Machotka, P. Messages of the Body. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Staffieri, J. R. A study of social stereotypes of body image in children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1965.

Staffieri, J. R. A study of social stereotypes of body image in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7 (No.1), 101-104.

Staffieri, J. R. Body build and behavioral expectancies in young females. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6 (No.1), 125-127.

Strongman, K. T. & Hart, C. J. Stereotyped reactions to body build. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1175-78.

Susan, N. The effects of body image on children. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1973, 37, 456-63.

Thornton, G. The effect of wearing glasses upon judgments of persons seen briefly. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1944, 28, 203-207.

Tuddenham, R. D. Studies in reputation: Correlates of popularity among elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1951, 42, 257-76.

Walker, R. N. Body build and behavior in young children: Body build and nursery school teachers' ratings. Monographs of Social Research in Child Development, 1962, 27, 94.

Walker, R. N. Body build and behavior in young children: Body build and parents' ratings. Child Development, 1963, 34, 1-23.

Wells, W. & Siegal, B. Stereotyped somatotypes. Psychological Reports, 1961, 8, 77-78.

Wilson, P. R. Perceptual distortion of height as a function of ascribed academic status. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 74, 97-102.